# First Executive Session Soudan Underground Laboratory Operations Director's Review

May 14-15, 2003

L. Edward Temple, Jr.

## Agenda for Exec Session

- Charge to Reviewers
- Review Agenda
- Report Table of Contents
  - including proposed subcommittee assignments
  - subcommittee leads designated by underlining
- Report Structure
- Findings, Comments, and Recomendations
- Discussion

#### Charge (1)

## Director's Review of MINOS/CDMS - Soudan Laboratory Operations May 14-15, 2003

#### Charge to the Review Committee

The primary purpose of this review is to assess management and budget matters regarding the operation of Fermilab experiments at the Soudan Underground Laboratory. (Note this is not to be a technical review of the experiments, though technical issues may need to be addressed in order to understand operations.)

The Committee should review the status of the on-going Fermilab Experiments at the Soudan Underground Laboratory, in particular the way they will operate at the Laboratory. The overall management of the Laboratory should be assessed, with particular attention being paid to the role played by Fermilab. The Laboratory's operating expenses, both manpower and materials and services, should be evaluated in light of present budget allocations and potential budget reductions.

We would like the Committee to comment on the relationships among the interested parties, namely Fermilab, the University of Minnesota and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

We would like the Committee to comment on the possible impact of the proposed potential expansion of the Laboratory program on the current program activities.

#### Charge (2)

We would like the Committee to comment on the relationships among the interested parties, namely Fermilab, the University of Minnesota and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

We would like the Committee to comment on the possible impact of the proposed potential expansion of the Laboratory program on the current program activities.

The Committee should review and comment on current and planned MoU/SoW/PO (MoU – Memorandum of Understanding, SoW – Statement of Work, PO – Purchase Order) procedures and the effectiveness of using these processes to highly specify the scope of operations. Cost estimates including labor should be addressed answering the questions

- What's involved??
- What's in??
- What's not??.

The Committee should examine management structure and instruments used for management agreements, specifying budget, facility components, and identifying any University of Minnesota and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources contributions.

#### Agenda (1)

#### Wednesday, May 14, 2003

8:30	Executive Session	Review Committee
9:00	Welcome	K. Stanfield
9:10	Introduction and Overview of Talks	R. Rameika
9:20	Lab Management and Organization (I)	E. Peterson
10:00	Status of CDMS	B. Cabrerra
10:30	Break	
10:45	Status of MINOS	S. Woijicki
11:15	MINOS Installation Closeout & Operations	Jeff Nelson
11:45	CDMS Operations Model	Dan Bauer
12:15	Networking and Computer Support at SUL	Liz Buckley-Geer
12:30	Lunch	
1:30	Outreach Programs at SUL	B. Miller
1:45	Laboratory Operating Budget Analysis	Gina Rameika
2:30	Laboratory Management and Organization (II)	Earl Peterson
3:15	Break	
3:30	Breakout Sessions	
4:45	Closed Session	review committee & invitees
5:30	Executive Session	review committee
6:30	Dinner	

# Agenda (2)

#### Thursday, May 15, 2003 - One West

8:30	Laboratory Safety Program	B. Miller
8:45	MINOS Control Room at FNAL	C. James
9:00	Planning for Future Initiatives	M. Marshak
9:45	Break	
10:00	Resume Breakouts/Begin Report Writing	
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Finalize Report	
2:00	Closeout Dry Run	
3:00	Closeout with Management	

# Table of Contents

SUL Operations Director's Review

Brice, Merritt

Green, Borowski,

Garbincius, Temple

Borowski, Sinclair,

McCammon, Brice

Stone, Sinclair,

Mcammon, Brice

	Executive Summary	Temple
1.1	Status and Operating Plans	Sinclair, Stone McCammon,

Management of SUL

**Program Expansion** 

Cost Estimate & Planned Funding

Possible Impact of Potential Laboratory

1.2

1.3

1.4

## Report Preparation and Structure

- Review findings, assessments, and recommendations should be presented in writing at a closeout with the Collaboration and Fermilab management.
- Written with
  - Findings
  - Comments and
  - Recommendations

### Findings, Comments, and Recommendations

Findings

• Findings are statements of fact that summarize noteworthy information presented during the review.

Comments

- Comments are judgment statements about the facts presented during the review. The reviewers' comments are based on their experiences and expertise.
- The comments are to be evaluated by the project team and actions taken as deemed appropriate.
- Recommendations
  - Recommendations are statements of actions that should be addressed by the project team.
  - A response to the recommendation is expected and it is expected that the actions taken would be reported on during future reviews.

# Report Compilation

Please provide Draft Report sections to

Marilyn Smith (oboe@fnal.gov)

Thursday as they are available so hardcopies can be made for the closeout.

# Discussion

Questions and Answers